



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION**

ROSE B. MOUMOUNI,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	Civil Action No.: 0:22-1697-MGL
	§	
CHESTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT ET	§	
AL., WENDELL SUMTER, DANIEL	§	
PFIEFFER, DANA COLTER-WILLIAMS, DR.	§	
JEANIE LIGON, DR. ANTWON SUTTON,	§	
and DEMORRIOUS ROBINSON,	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DISMISSING INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS WITH PREJUDICE**

Plaintiff Rose B. Moumouni (Moumouni), proceeding pro se, filed a complaint against Defendants Wendall Sumter, Daniel Pfeiffer, Dana Colter-Williams, Dr. Jeanie Ligon, Dr. Antwon Sutton, and Demorrious Robinson (collectively, the Individual Defendants) and Defendant Chester County School District, alleging violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (Title VII), 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, *et seq.* and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681, *et seq.*

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court dismiss the Individual Defendants from this action with prejudice. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the

Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on August 3, 2022. To date, Moumouni has failed to file any objections, although she has moved to amend her complaint, apparently to omit the Individual Defendants.

“[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court the Individual Defendants are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 24th day of August 2022, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis _____
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.